

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claim 19 has been canceled by the foregoing amendments. Claims 2-18 and 20-34 are now pending in the application.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Rejections on Cox in view of Lau

The Examiner has rejected claims 2-4, 6-23 and 25-34 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication 2003/0216145 to Cox et al. (hereafter "Cox") in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication 5,890,088 to Nimura et al. (hereafter "Nimura"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 2, as amended, recites:

A method of responding to a route planning service request initiated from a first mobile station, the first mobile station being located at a first mobile station position, the route-planning service request defining an identifying-parameter, the method comprising, in combination:

identifying the first mobile station position based on the identifying-parameter;

receiving a destination telephone number, wherein the destination telephone number is a telephone number of a second mobile station;

identifying a destination position corresponding to the destination telephone number;

generating or obtaining a route plan for travel from the first mobile station position to the destination position; and

conveying the route plan for receipt by a person.

Claim 2 recites a method of responding to a route planning service request initiated from a first mobile station that comprises receiving a destination telephone number and identifying a destination position corresponding to the destination telephone number for use in route planning. Claim 2 has been amended to recite that the destination telephone number is a telephone number of a second mobile station.

Cox relates to a method of providing directional assistance to a telephone subscriber. In the method of Cox, a Mobile Identification Number or Electronic Serial Number is included in a call stream from a mobile phone to a directory assistance center. Cox teaches that a user identifies the location of his/her destination to a directory assistance agent. Cox further teaches that the user may provide his/her current location or that location may be determined based on information contained in the call stream associated with the user's call. *See page 3, paragraph 0026.*

As the Examiner concedes, Cox does not teach, disclose or describe receiving a destination telephone number and identifying a destination position corresponding to the destination telephone number for use in planning a route, as is recited in claim 2.

The Examiner cites Nimura as teaching the use of destination telephone number. However, the Examiner concedes that Nimura does not expressly disclose that the destination telephone number is the telephone number of a second mobile station. Nevertheless, the Examiner asserts that claim 18 (and now, presumably, claim 2) is obvious on Cox in view of Nimura. Applicant respectfully disagrees with this assertion by the Examiner.

Cox and Nimura are both directed to providing directional assistance to fixed physical street addresses. In the approach set forth in Cox, a mobile station user provides the physical street address and is provided with a route plan from his/her current location to the provided physical street address. Likewise, Nimura is also directed to providing directional assistance to a fixed physical street addresses. In fact, one aspect of the approach disclosed in Nimura is to provide a rendering or image representing the fixed physical street address destination, such as a building. That is, Nimura teaches providing directional assistance to the destination associated with a phone number associated with the physical street address. Neither Cox nor Nimura

teaches, suggests or describes providing directional assistance to a user of a first mobile station to the location of a second mobile station, as recited in claim 2.

In contrast to the proposed combination of Cox and Nimura, claim 2 recites receiving a destination telephone number, wherein the destination telephone number is a telephone number of a second mobile station. In such a system, because the destination phone number is the phone number of a second mobile station, the location of the phone number is determined as result of a request for directional assistance to the location of the second mobile station. For example, one approach that may be employed is described in the application on page 11, lines 3-12, which recites:

[I]dentifying a destination position corresponding to the destination telephone number may comprise a machine querying a location system for the destination position by a query keyed to the destination telephone number. In that regard, the destination telephone number could be a telephone number of a second mobile station, and the location system could comprise a mobile positioning system, such that the mobile positioning may responsively determine a location of the second mobile station and return the location to the machine as the destination position. Alternatively, the destination telephone number could be a landline telephone number, and the location system may comprise a landline location system, such that the landline location system may responsively determine a location corresponding to the landline telephone number and return the location to the machine as the destination position.

Such an approach employs a mobile positioning system included in a location system to responsively determine the destination location by determining the location of the second mobile station. Neither Cox nor Nimura teach suggest or describe such an approach. Therefore, claim 2 is not obvious over the proposed combination, and the rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 3, 4, 6-23 and 25-30 depend ultimately from claim 2 and include all of its limitations, as well as the limitations of any intervening claims. Therefore claims 3, 4, 6-23 and 25-30 are not obvious over the combination of Cox and Nimura by virtue of claim dependency.

Claim 31, as amended, recites:

A method for assisting a mobile station user to get from a current first mobile station position to a destination position, the method comprising, in combination:

receiving a route planning service request and responsively initiating a route planning session;

generating a mobile station position inquiry, whereby the mobile station position inquiry may be forwarded to a mobile positioning system to establish the mobile station position;

receiving, in response to the mobile station position inquiry, an indication of the first mobile station position,

receiving a destination telephone number, wherein the destination telephone number is a telephone number of a second mobile station;

initiating an inquiry to identify a destination position corresponding to the destination telephone number;

generating a route plan for travel from the first mobile station position to the destination position;

conveying the route plan for receipt by the user,

whereby the route plan may assist the user to travel from the first mobile station position to the destination position.

Claim 31 recites a method for assisting a mobile station user to get from a current mobile station position to a destination position comprising receiving a destination telephone number, wherein the destination telephone number is the telephone number of a second mobile station, and initiating an inquiry to identify a destination position corresponding to the destination telephone number for use in route planning.

As was discussed above with respect to claim 2, Cox does not teach, describe or disclose receiving a destination telephone number and determining a destination position corresponding to the telephone number. Cox, in contrast, describes a method where the user provides the location of the destination. See “*second location 14*” in *Figure 1* and the associated description on page 3, paragraph 0026. Furthermore, as was also discussed with respect to claim 2, Nimura does not teach, suggest or describe modifying the method of Cox in such a fashion. Therefore, claim 31 is not obvious over the combination of Cox and Nimura for the same reasons as were

described above with respect to claim 2.

Claim 32 depends from claim 31 and includes all of its limitations. Therefore, claim 32 is not obvious over Cox in view of Lau by virtue of claim dependency. Based on the foregoing, the rejection of claims 31 and 32 should be withdrawn.

Claim 33 is directed to a route planning application server that comprises a set of machine language instructions for receiving a destination telephone number, where the destination phone number is a mobile station phone number, and for responsively initiating an inquiry to identify a destination position corresponding to the destination telephone number for use in route planning. Therefore, claim 33 distinguishes from the combination of Cox and Nimura on a similar basis as discussed above with respect to claims 2 and 31. Thus, the rejection of claim 33 should be withdrawn.

Claim 34 recites:

A method comprising:
receiving a route planning request;
receiving a destination telephone number, wherein the destination telephone number is a telephone number of a first mobile station;
determining a second mobile station location;
based on the second mobile station location and the destination telephone number, establishing a route plan for travel from the mobile station location to a location corresponding to the destination telephone number; and
providing the route plan.

The method of claim 34 comprises receiving a destination telephone number, wherein the destination telephone number is a telephone number of a first mobile station and establishing, based on a location of a second mobile station and the destination telephone number, a route plan for travel from the location of the second mobile station and a location corresponding to the destination telephone number (the location of the first mobile station). As was discussed above with respect to claims 2 and 31, the combination of Cox and Nimura does not teach, suggest or

describe such a method. Therefore, claim 34 distinguishes from Cox and Nimura on a similar basis as claims 2 and 31, and the rejection of claim 34 should be withdrawn.

Rejections on Cox and Nimura and further in view of Schwartz

The Examiner has rejected claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cox and Nimura and further in view of U.S. Patent Publication Application Publication 2002/0160790 A1 to Schwartz et al. (hereafter "Schwartz").

Claim 5 depends from claim 2 and includes all of its limitations. Because claim 2 is not obvious over the proposed combination of Cox, Nimura and Schwartz, claim 5 is also not obvious by virtue of claim dependency.

As was discussed above with respect to claim 2, the combination of Cox and Nimura does not teach, suggest or describe receiving a destination telephone number, where the destination telephone number is a telephone number of a mobile station, and identifying a destination position corresponding to the destination telephone number for use in planning a route, as recited in claim 2. Schwartz does not up make for these deficiencies of Cox and Nimura.

Schwartz is directed to a method and architecture for interactive two-way communication, not to providing directional assistance. The Examiner does not assert that Schwartz teaches the above aspects of claim 2 and merely cites Schwartz for the use of an Internet Protocol address. Thus, even were one of skill in the art to combine Schwartz with Cox and Nimura, which it is not conceded that he/she would, that combination would still lack receiving a destination telephone number and identifying a destination position corresponding to the destination telephone number for use in planning a route, as recited in claim 2. Therefore,

claim 2 is not obvious over the proposed combination of Cox, Nimura and Schwartz. Further claim 5 is not obvious over the proposed combination by virtue of its dependency on claim 2. Thus, the rejection should be withdrawn.

Rejections on Cox and Nimura and further in view of Lau

The Examiner has rejected claim 24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cox and Nimura and further in view of U.S. Patent Publication Application Publication 2002/0168986 A1 to Lau et al. (hereafter "Lau").

Claim 24 depends from claim 2 and includes all of its limitations. Because claim 2 is not obvious over the proposed combination of Cox, Nimura and Lau, claim 24 is also not obvious by virtue of claim dependency.

As was discussed above with respect to claim 2, the combination of Cox and Nimura does not teach, suggest or describe receiving a destination telephone number, where the destination telephone number is a telephone number of a mobile station, and identifying a destination position corresponding to the destination telephone number for use in planning a route, as recited in claim 2. Lau does not up make for these deficiencies of Cox and Nimura.

The Examiner does not assert that Lau teaches the above aspects of claim 2 and merely cites Lau for the use of a routing engine. Thus, even were one of skill in the art to combine Lau with Cox and Nimura, which it is not conceded that he/she would, that combination would still lack receiving a destination telephone number, where the destination telephone number is a telephone number of a mobile station, and identifying a destination position corresponding to the destination telephone number for use in planning a route, as recited in claim 2. Therefore, claim 2 is not obvious over the proposed combination of Cox, Nimura and Schwartz. Further claim 24

is not obvious over the proposed combination by virtue of its dependency on claim 2. Thus, the rejection should be withdrawn.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, all of the pending claims are in condition for allowance. If the Examiner has any questions, he is invited to contact the undersigned at (360) 379-6514. An early allowance of all the claims is respectfully requested.

Respectfully Submitted,

McDonnell Boehnen Hulbert & Berghoff

Date:

Aug. 31, 2004

By:

Paul W. Churilla

Paul W. Churilla

Reg. No. 47,495